Remarks

Applicant notes with appreciation that that the Examiner has identified Claims 3-11, 26-34, 39-42, 44 and 45 as being directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 49 and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 2, 12-14, 17-25, 35-38, 47-48 and 51-58 are rejected. Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendment and remarks is requested. Claims 1, 15-16, 23-25, 43, 46-48 and 55 have been canceled. Claims 2, 12, 17-21, 35-38, 49, 51-54, and 56-58 have been amended. Pending claims 2-14, 17-22 26-42, 44-45 and 49-59 remain in the application.

ARGUMENT

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections:

Claims 1, 2, 12-14, 17-21, 23-25, 35-38, 47-48 and 51-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2004/0006621 to Bellinson et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0124252 to Schaefer et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, which should be withdrawn for at least the reasons set forth herein.

Claim 1 is canceled. The limitations of Claim 1 have been incorporated into newly added Claim 59. Claim 59 is dependent on allowable base Claim 3, and is therefore believed allowable.

Claims 2, 12, 17-21 are amended to be dependent on allowable base Claim 3, and are therefore believed allowable.

Claims 13-14, and are now dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 23-25 are canceled.

Claims 35-38 are amended to depend on allowable base Claim 26.

Claims 47-48 are canceled. Claim 49 is amended to put it into independent form.

Claims 51-54 are amended to depend on allowable base Claim 49.

Claim 55 is canceled.

Claims 56-58 are amended to depend on allowable based Claim 39.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2004/0006621 to Bellinson et al. in view of US Patent Application Publication 2003/0097452 to Kim et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, which should be withdrawn for at least the reasons set forth herein.

Claim 22 is amended to require that *if the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, dynamically enabling an operator of a second computer to determine whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer.* The Examiner asserts that Bellinson et al. teach that a second computer may grant access to a request for a web page by a first computer. However, Bellinson et al. do not teach or suggest that an operator may dynamically determine whether to grant the request. Bellinson et al. do not teach that an operator may grant access dynamically, but only that the second computer attempts to determine the category of the requested web page and check user profiles to determine whether the web page should be granted. Further, Kim et al. do not teach or suggest, at the cited reference, that a television on a home network may be used interactively and dynamically by an operator to grant access to web pages requested on a computer on the network. Applicant believes that these references have been improperly combined and that combining their teachings will not result in Applicant's claimed invention.

The Examiner objects to the term "dynamically" and asserts that this limitation is not found in the Specification as originally filed. Applicant disagrees.

Beginning at Para. [0024] it is described:

> "If the URL is not included in the table of acceptable URLs, gatekeeper PC 106 accepts the request from the corresponding child PC, retrieves the Web page corresponding to the requested URL from the Internet, and sends the corresponding Web page to parent PC 104 to be previewed by the parent/guardian for acceptable viewing by the child."

Para. [0025] then describes:

> "In one embodiment, the URL data is passed to the parent/guardian PC. A rendered thumbnail of the Web page may be used as an icon that the parent clicks on with

a pointing device, such as, but not limited to, a mouse, to activate access of the link. Thus, in this embodiment, the entire Web page is not cached and sent to the parent/guardian."

Further description of this dynamic or immediate approval process may be found, at least in Para. [0024] to [0030]. It will be apparent to one of skill in the art that when the URL is not found in the approved table, that a thumbnail is immediately sent to the parent or guardian (operator) so that the operator may grant access to the URL. It will be understood that this process takes place in a dynamic fashion. Common definitions for the term "dynamically" are (1) relating to an object, or objects, in motion; (2) energetic; vigorous; forceful; and (3) relating to or tending toward change or productive activity. (See URL www*yourdictionary*com/dynamically, where periods are replaced with asterisks to avoid unintentional hyperlinks). In this case, the term dynamically is meant in its common form of relating or tending toward change or productive activity. It will be understood that when the URL is not found, the access request is sent to the operator for immediate resolution, e.g., dynamically. This is in contrast to the system taught in Bellinson et al.

Bellinson et al. teach a system where an administrative computer is used to help determine whether access to a URL should be granted. Settings are stored on the second computer, but a request is not immediately forwarded to an operator for immediate resolution. The Specification describes that the parent or guardian (operator) receive the request for access and will proceed to act upon it. In this embodiment, there is no delay, or caching of the request. Instead the access may be granted dynamically, in real time, e.g., immediately. Therefore, the rejection to Claim 22 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Claims 2-14, 17-22 26-42, 44-45 and 49-59 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 633-6845. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 25 Feb. 2009

/ Joni D. Stutman-Horn /
Joni D. Stutman-Horn, Reg. No. 42,173
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
(703) 633-6845

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402